arXiv:physics/0102013v1 [physics.gen-ph] 6 Feb 2001

COVARIANT FORMULATION OF ELECTROMAGNETIC 4-MOMENTUM IN TERMS OF 4-VECTORS E^{α} AND B^{α}

Tomislav Ivezić

Ruđer *Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia*
ivezic@rudjer.irb.hr

Abstract

The fundamental difference between the true transformations (TT) and the apparent transformations (AT) is explained. The TT refer to the same quantity, while the AT refer, e.g., to the same measurement in different inertial frames of reference. It is shown that the usual transformations of the three-vectors **E** and **B** are - the AT. The covariant electrodynamics with the four-vectors E^{α} and B^{α} of the electric and magnetic field is constructed. It is also shown that the conventional synchronous definitions of the electromagnetic energy and momentum contain both, the AT of the volume, i.e., the Lorentz contraction, and the AT of **E** and **B**, while Rohrlich's expressions contain only the AT of **E** and **B**. A manifestly covariant expression for the energy-momentum density tensor and the electromagnetic 4-momentum is constructed using E^{α} and B^{α}. The "4/3" problem is discussed and it is shown that all previous treatments either contain the AT of the volume, or the AT of **E** and **B**, or both of them. In our approach all quantities are four-dimensional spacetime tensors whose transformations are the TT.

Key words: electromagnetic 4-momentum, 4-vectors E^{α} and B^{α}

1 INTRODUCTION

The correct expressions for the electromagnetic energy and momentum and their transformation properties are topics of repeated discussions in this journal and elsewhere. Two approaches to these problems can be distinguished. The main points of both approaches are fairly well exposed in the Rohrlich- Boyer discussion [1, 2] and in the subsequent Comment [3].

In 1966. Rohrlich [4] introduced the notions of the true and apparent transformations of physical quantities. The transformations of the four-dimensional (4D) spacetime tensors referring to the same quantity considered in different inertial frames of reference (IFRs) are the true transformations (TT). They are in full agreement with the special relativity as the theory of 4D spacetime with pseudo-Euclidean geometry. An example of the TT are the Lorentz transformations (LT) of 4D tensor quantities. On the contrary the transformations which do not refer to the same physical quantity, e.g., the transformations which refer to the same measurement in different IFRs, are the apparent transformations (AT). Rohrlich [4] and Gamba [5] discussed different examples of the TT and the AT and explicitly showed that the Lorentz contraction of length (volume) belongs to the class of - the AT.

The fundamental difference between the AT and the TT of physical quantities is previously mainly overlooked. The importance of that difference is emphasized in this paper and it is shown here that the usual transformations of the electric **E** and the magnetic **B** fields as the three-vectors (3-vectors) also belong to the class of - the AT. The 4-vectors E^{α} and B^{α} are introduced instead of **E** and **B** and the covariant Maxwell equations are formulated in terms of E^{α} and B^{α}. This alternative covariant formulation with E^{α} and B^{α} is equivalent to the usual covariant electrodynamics with the electromagnetic field tensor $F^{\alpha\beta}$, (see also [6]).

It has to be pointed out that our covariant approach with E^{α} and B^{α} does not make use of the intermediate electromagnetic 4-potential A^{μ}, and thus dispenses with the need for gauge conditions.

The existence of the difference between the AT and the TT causes that one can speak about two forms of relativity: the "AT relativity" and the "TT relativity." The former is the conventional special relativity based on Einstein's relativity of simultaneity and on the synchronous definition of length, i.e., on the AT of length and time, and, as shown here, on the AT of the electric and magnetic 3-vectors **E** and **B**. The "TT relativity," or, equivalently, the covariant formulation of relativity, is based on the TT of physical quantities as 4D spacetime tensors, i.e., on the covariant definition of length, and the covariant electrodynamics with $F^{\alpha\beta}$ or, equivalently, as shown here, with 4-vectors E^{α} and B^{α}.

The alternative covariant approach is used to discuss different definitions of the electromagnetic momentum and energy, and also to discuss the related "4/3" problem in the electromagnetic mass of the electron. First in Sec. 2 the AT and the TT of length (volume) and of the electric and magnetic fields are considered. It is also shown that, contrary to von Laue's theorem, an integral of a symmetric tensor of second rank over the hyperplane $t = const.$ does not form a true 4-vector, since the transformation of that integral from an IFR S to another IFR S' is - an AT. These results are used in all other Sections. In Sec. 3 it is proved that the conventional definitions of the electromagnetic energy and momentum are not covariant definitions, since they are synchronous definitions, which use the AT of volume elements, i.e., the Lorentz contraction, and the AT for $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. Rohrlich's approach is discussed in Sec. 4. It is shown that neither Rohrlich's relations for the electromagnetic energy and momentum define the true 4-vector, since the electromagnetic field tensor $F^{\alpha\beta}$ is expressed in terms of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ and the AT for $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are used. In Sec. 5 we replace $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ with E^{α} and B^{α} and compare the obtained expressions with Rohrlich's relations containing $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. Furthermore, the 4/3 problem in the electromagnetic mass is discussed in this Section. In Sec. 6 some recent treatments of the electromagnetic energy and momentum and of the 4/3 problem are discussed and it is shown that in all of them either the AT of volume elements, or the AT of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, or both of them, are used. This means that none of these treatments do conform with the "TT relativity."

2 TRUE AND APPARENT TRANSFORMATIONS

According to the "modern" point of view the special relativity is the theory of 4D spacetime with pseudo-Euclidean geometry. Quantities of physical interest, both local and nonlocal, are represented in the special relativity by spacetime tensors, i.e., as covariant quantities. *The laws of physics are written in the special relativity in a manifestly covariant way as tensorial equations. The geometry of the spacetime is defined by the invariant infinitesimal spacetime distance ds of two neighboring points,* $ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^{\mu}dx^{\nu}$ ($g_{\mu\nu}$ is the metric tensor; Greek indices run from 0 to 3, latin indices run from 1 to 3, and repeated indices imply summation). *The laws of physics written as tensorial equations with 4D spacetime tensors in an IFR will have the same form in some other IFR, i.e., in new coordinates, if new and old coordinates are connected by those coordinate transformations that leave the interval ds, and thus the pseudo-Euclidean geometry of the spacetime, unchanged.* This means that in the reference frames that are connected by such coordinate transformations all physical phenomena will proceed in the same way, (taking into account the corresponding initial and boundary conditions), and thus there is no physical difference between them, (the principle of relativity). The transformations that leave ds unchanged also transform a physical quantity represented by 4D spacetime tensor from an IFR S to another IFR S'; the same quantity is considered in S and S'. Such transformations are the TT and an example of them are, as already said, the LT between IFRs. The meaning of the same quantity Rohrlich [4] expresses in the following way: "A quantity is therefore physically meaningful (in the sense that it is of the same nature to all observers) if it has tensorial properties under Lorentz transformations." Similarly Gamba [5], when discussing the sameness of a physical quantity (for example, the quantity $A_{\mu}(x_{\lambda}, X_{\lambda})$, which is a function of two points x_{λ} and X_{λ}) for different IFRs S and S', declares: "The quantity $A_{\mu}(x_{\lambda}, X_{\lambda})$ for S is the same as the quantity $A'_{\mu}(x'_{\lambda}, X'_{\lambda})$ for S' when all the primed quantities are obtained from the corresponding unprimed quantities through Lorentz transformations (tensor calculus)."

It has to be noted that, in principle, one can choose any reference frame in which some physical quantity is covariantly defined, and then the same quantity is considered in all other reference frames, transforming all parts of that quantity by the TT. The whole physics will not depend on the chosen frame. However, the most convenient choice for systems with rest mass is the rest frame, since in that frame one retains the similarity with the prerelativistic physics.

2.1 True and Apparent Transformations of Length (Volume)

The definition of length (volume) which is in accordance with all the above consideration is - the covariant definition of length (see, e.g., Ref. 7 and references therein, or for the volume [4, 5]). The invariant spacetime length (the Lorentz scalar) is formed as $l = (l^\mu l_\mu)^{1/2}$ where l_μ is the distance 4-vector between two spatial points A and B on the (moving) object, $l^\mu = x_B^\mu - x_A^\mu$, $x_{A,B}^\mu$ are the position 4-vectors in some IFR S. (We use Cartesian space coordinates x^i and time $t(x^0 \equiv ct)$. Without loss of generality we work in an IFR with the Minkowski metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}{=}diag(-1,1,1,1)$.) The observers in all other IFRs will look at the same events but associating with them different coordinates; it is the essence of the covariant description. The LT of the position 4-vectors, of the distance 4-vector, and of the invariant spacetime length are all the TT.

In contrast to the covariant definition of length and the TT of the spacetime tensors *the synchronous definition of length*, introduced by Einstein [8], *defines length as the spatial distance between two points on the (moving) object measured by simultaneity in the rest frame of the observer.* Let l_0 be the rest length, or the three-dimensional volume dV_0, measured by simultaneity in S_0, the rest frame of the object, at some $t_0 = a$. Then the length l' (the 3D volume dV') determined simultaneously in some IFR S', at some $t' = b$, is Lorentz contracted, $l' = l_0(1-\beta^2)^{1/2}$, $(dV' = dV_{00}(1-\beta^2)^{1/2})$, ($\beta = V/c$, V is the relative velocity of S_0 and S'. It has to be emphasized that $t_0 = a$ in S_0 and $t' = b$ in S' are not related by the LT or any other coordinate transformation. The time component is not transformed in the Lorentz contraction. This means that the observers in S_0 and S' do not look at the same events. Hence the quantities l_0 and l' synchronously determined in the rest frame of the observer *refer to the same measurement in S_0 and S'* and not to the same 4D tensor quantity. *Therefore the Lorentz contraction as the transformation connecting them is - the AT.*

2.2 Von Laue's theorem

The existence of the fundamental difference between the TT and the AT enables us to examine an important theorem (it is sometimes called "von Laue's theorem"), which is widely used in the theory of relativity and in the quantum theory of fields. This theorem roughly states: The necessary and sufficient condition for the hyperplane integral of a symmetric tensor of second rank T $(\int_\Sigma T^{\mu\nu}(x) d^3\sigma_\nu(x))$ to be independent of the orientation of that hyperplane (Σ) is that T be divergence-free, $\partial_\nu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$, (local conservation law); and if that integral is orientation-independent, then it can be written as $\int_{t=a} T^{\mu 0}(\mathbf{r},t) d^3x$ and it is 1) independent of time, $(\int_{t=a} T^{\mu 0}(\mathbf{r},t) d^3x = \int_{t=b} T^{\mu 0}(\mathbf{r},t) d^3x)$, and 2) it is a 4-vector, (the proof of that theorem can be found in, e.g., Ref .9, Sec. 5.8, and Ref. 10). We are not interesting in the time independence of that integral but in its 4-vector character. In the proof of 2) the integrals are taken over the hypersurfaces $t = a$ in S and $t' = b$ in S'. According to the previous discussion about the sameness of a physical quantity for different IFRs, and the related consideration about the TT and the AT, we conclude: *The integral $\int_{t=a} T^{\mu 0}(\mathbf{r},t) d^3x$ cannot be a true 4-vector from the "TT viewpoint."* Namely, *this integral does not refer to the same quantity considered from different IFRs, (which are connected by the LT), since the hyperplanes taken at $t = a$ in S and $t' = b$ in S' are not related in any way.* Thus, e.g., the primed elements of volume d^3x' in the integral in S' $(\int_{t'=b} T'^{\mu 0}(\mathbf{r}',t') d^3x')$ are not obtained by the LT from S, than they are simply the elements of volume of *an arbitrary chosen hypersurface $t' = b$ in S'. The transformation connecting the integrals in S and S' is - an AT, since not all parts of that compound physical quantity are transformed by the LT from S to S'.* The situation with the transformation of that integral is quite similar to the already discussed Lorentz contraction as an AT. We see that, contrary to von Laue's theorem, the vanishing of the divergence of T does not assure that the mentioned integral is a true 4-vector. The considerations and the proofs given in the previous literature neglected that the "TT relativity" demands the same physical quantity to be considered from different IFRs, i.e., that all parts of that quantity have to be transformed by the LT from S to S'.

2.3 The Proof that the Transformations of E and B are - the AT

As a next example we consider the transformations of **E** and **B**. It is generally believed that the covariant formulation of the electrodynamics with $F^{\alpha\beta}$ and the usual formulation with **E** and **B** are equivalent, and therefore that the usual transformations of **E** and **B** are actually the TT. However we show that these transformations also belong to the class of - the AT, (see also[6]). In the modern derivation of the transformation relations for **E** and **B**, (see, e.g., Ref. 11 Sec. 11.10, Ref. 9 Sec. 3.3.), one identifies, in some IFR S, the components of the 3-vectors E_i and B_i with the components of $F^{\alpha\beta}$ as $E_i = F^{0i}$, and $B_i = (1/c)^* F^{0i}$ in order to get in that IFR the usual Maxwell equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r},t) &= \rho(\mathbf{r},t)/\varepsilon_0, \quad \nabla\times\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r},t) = -\partial\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r},t)/\partial t, \\ \nabla \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r},t) &= 0, \quad \nabla\times\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r},t) = \mu_0\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r},t) + \mu_0\varepsilon_0\partial\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r},t)/\partial t, \end{aligned}$$

from the covariant Maxwell equations with $F^{\alpha\beta}$ and its dual ${}^*F^{\alpha\beta}$

$$\partial_\alpha F^{\alpha\beta} = -j^\beta/\varepsilon_0 c, \quad \partial_\alpha\ {}^*F^{\alpha\beta} = 0$$

where ${}^*F^{\alpha\beta} = -(1/2)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}F_{\gamma\delta}$ and $\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ is the totally skew-symmetric Levi-Civita pseudotensor. (Note that in the covariant formulation $F^{\alpha\beta}$ is the primary quantity; it is the solution of the covariant Maxwell equations, or the corresponding wave equation $\partial^\sigma\partial_\sigma F_{\alpha\beta} - (1/\varepsilon_0 c)(\partial_\beta j_\alpha - \partial_\alpha j_\beta) = 0$, and it conveys all the information about the electromagnetic field. $F^{\alpha\beta}$ is generally given as

$$F^{\alpha\beta}(x^\mu) = (2k/i\pi c)\int\left\{\frac{\left[j^\alpha(x'^\mu)(x-x')^\beta - j^\beta(x'^\mu)(x-x')^\alpha\right]}{\left[(x-x')^\sigma(x-x')_\sigma\right]^2}\right\}d^4x',$$

where x^α, x'^α are the position 4-vectors of the field point and the source point respectively, and $k = 1/4\pi\varepsilon_0$.) After transforming by the LT the covariant Maxwell equations to the S' frame one finds $\partial'_\alpha F'^{\alpha\beta} = -j'^\beta/\varepsilon_0 c, \quad \partial'_\alpha\ {}^*F'^{\alpha\beta} = 0$. The transformations of all quantities in the covariant Maxwell equations are - the TT. The covariant Maxwell equations do not change their form on the LT embodying in that way the principle of relativity. Then one again identifies the 3-vectors E'_i and B'_i with the components of $F'^{\alpha\beta}$ *in the same way as in* S, i.e., $E'_i = F'^{0i}$, and $B'_i = (1/c)^* F'^{0i}$ in order to obtain the usual Maxwell equations (in the three-vector form) from the transformed covariant Maxwell equations. This procedure then gives the connection between the 3-vectors E'_i, B'_i in S' and E_i, B_i in S as

$$\begin{aligned} E_i &= \Gamma(E'_i - c\varepsilon_{ijk}\beta_j B'_k) - ((\Gamma-1)/\beta^2)\beta_i(\beta_k E'_k) \\ B_i &= \Gamma(B'_i - (1/c)\varepsilon_{ijk}\beta_j E'_k) - ((\Gamma-1)/\beta^2)\beta_i(\beta_k B'_k), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\beta = V/c$ and $\Gamma = (1-\beta^2)^{-1/2}$. (The components of the 3-vector fields **E** and **B**, and of the 3-velocity **V** are written with lowered (generic) subscripts, since they are not the spatial components of the 4-vectors. This refers to the third-rank antisymmetric ε tensor too. The super- and subscripts are used only on the components of the 4-vectors or tensors.) According to (1) the components of, e.g., the 3-vector $\mathbf{E}'$ in S' are determined by the components of both 3-vectors **E** and **B** in S. Obviously **E** in S, *measured by the observers at rest in* S, and $\mathbf{E}'$ in S', *measured by the observers at rest in* S', (the same holds for **B** and $\mathbf{B}'$), *do not refer to the same quantity considered in* S *and* S', *but to the same measurement*, as in the Lorentz contraction, and consequently the 3-vectors **E** and $\mathbf{E}'$ (**B** and $\mathbf{B}'$) are not connected by the TT than by the AT, Eq. (1).

2.4 The 4-vectors E^α and B^α and the AT of E and B

Although $F^{\alpha\beta}$ contains all the information about the electromagnetic field one can introduce the 4-vectors E^α and B^α instead of the usual 3-vectors **E** and **B**. The E^α and B^α are well defined quantities from the "TT viewpoint" and they are defined by means of $F^{\alpha\beta}$ as

$$E^\alpha = (1/c)F^{\alpha\beta}v_\beta, \quad B^\alpha = (1/c^2)^* F^{\alpha\beta}v_\beta. \tag{2}$$

The E^α and B^α are the electric and magnetic field 4-vectors measured by an observer moving with 4-velocity v^α in an arbitrary reference frame.

We note that in this paper E^α and B^α are defined in the same way as in [12], i.e., taking that v^α is the 4-velocity of a family of observers who measures the fields. But it is considered in [12] that E^α and B^α are necessary only for noninertial and curved spacetimes and not for IFRs. However the fundamental result that the usual transformations of **E** and **B**, Eq.(1), belong to the class of the AT necessitates the introduction of the 4-vectors E^α and B^α even for IFRs. The definition (2)can be compared with the definitions of E^α and B^α in, e.g., Ref. 13, where the covariant electrodynamics in the moving medium is considered and v^α is the 4-velocity of the medium, or in Ref. 14, where the physical meaning of v^α is unspecified - it is any unitary 4-vector. The reason for such choice of v^α in [14] is that there E^α and B^α are introduced as the "auxiliary fields," while **E** and **B** are considered as the physical fields. In our alternative covariant approach the situation is just the opposite; E^α and B^α are the real physical fields, which are correctly defined and measured in 4D spacetime, while the 3-vectors **E** and **B** are not correctly defined in 4D spacetime from the "TT viewpoint."

The introduction of E^α and B^α enables us to better explain why the transformations of **E** and **B**, (1), are the AT. Namely, *in the mentioned modern derivation of (1) two different families of observers who measure the electric field are considered, one at rest in the IFR S, for which* $v^\alpha = (c, \mathbf{0})$, *and another one at rest in the IFR S', for which again* $v'^\alpha = (c, \mathbf{0})$, *and these observers in* S *and* S' *are not related in any way.* Such assumptions for v^α and v'^α mean that *one does not consider the same physical quantity in* S *and* S', but that two different quantities E^α and Ξ'^α (in which v^α is not transformed) are considered in S and S', respectively. The quantity Ξ'^α has nothing in common with the electric field E^α. This means that the transformations (1) are the AT; *they refer to the same measurement in two IFRs and not to the same physical quantity as required by the "TT relativity."* The TT referring to the same physical quantity are the LT of E^α and B^α.

It has to be mentioned here that although Rohrlich, [4, 1] and Gamba [5] correctly insist on covariant definitions of various physical quantities, they also did not notice that equations (1) are the AT that do not refer to the same physical quantity in two IFRs.

2.5 Alternative Covariant Formulation with E^α and B^α

Using E^α and B^α one can construct the covariant formulation of electrodynamics, which is equivalent to the usual covariant formulation with $F^{\alpha\beta}$. For that one needs the inverse relations to the relations (2) in which $F^{\alpha\beta}$ will be expressed by means of E^α and B^α, and v^α, (compare with Refs. 13 and 14 taking into account the above mentioned remarks about the meaning of E^α, B^α, and v^α in these works). The inverse relations are

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\alpha\beta} &= (1/c)\delta^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} v^\mu E^\nu + \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} B_\mu v_\nu, \\ {}^*F^{\alpha\beta} &= \delta^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} v^\mu B^\nu + (1/c)\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} v_\mu E_\nu, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\delta^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} = \delta^\alpha_\mu \delta^\beta_\nu - \delta^\alpha_\nu \delta^\beta_\mu$. The 4-vectors E^α and B^α satisfy the conditions $v_\alpha E^\alpha = v_\beta B^\beta = 0$, as can be checked from (2) and (3). Substituting (3) into the covariant Maxwell equations with $F^{\alpha\beta}$ we obtain the covariant Maxwell equations with E^α and B^α,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha(\delta^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} v^\mu E^\nu) + c\partial_\alpha(\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} B_\mu v_\nu) &= -j^\beta/\varepsilon_0, \\ \partial_\alpha(\delta^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} v^\mu B^\nu) + (1/c)\partial_\alpha(\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} v_\mu E_\nu) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The relations (3) transform the covariant formulation with $F^{\alpha\beta}$ and ${}^*F^{\alpha\beta}$ to the covariant formulation with E^α and B^α, while the relations (2) do the reverse transformations, (see also [6]).

If one takes that in an IFR S the observers who measure E^α and B^α are at rest, i.e., $v^\alpha = (c, \mathbf{0})$, then $E^0 = B^0 = 0$, and one can derive from the covariant Maxwell equations with E^α and B^α the Maxwell equations which contain only the space parts E^i and B^i of E^α and B^α, e.g., from the first covariant Maxwell equation one easily finds $\partial_i E^i = j^0/\varepsilon_0 c$. We see that the Maxwell equations obtained in such a way are of the same form as the usual Maxwell equations with **E** and **B**. From the above consideration one concludes that all the results obtained in a given IFR S from the usual Maxwell equations with **E** and **B** remain valid in the covariant formulation with the 4-vectors E^α and B^α but only for the observers who measure the fields E^α and B^α and are at rest in the considered IFR. Then for such observers the components of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, which are not well defined quantities in the "TT relativity," can be simply replaced by the space components of the 4-vectors E^{α} and B^{α}. However, if the LT from S to another IFR S', moving with V^{α} relative to S, is performed, then in S' one cannot obtain the usual Maxwell equations with the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}'$ and $\mathbf{B}'$ (determined by the AT (1)) from the transformed covariant Maxwell equations with E'^{α} and B'^{α}.

3 CONVENTIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE ELECTROMAGNETIC MOMENTUM AND ENERGY

In this section we consider the conventional synchronous definitions of the electromagnetic momentum and energy, (see, e.g., Refs. 1-3, Refs. 15,16). The total 4-momentum of a charged system can be written as

$$P_{tot.}^{\mu}=(1/c)\int_{\Sigma}\left[\Theta^{\mu\nu}(x)+T^{\mu\nu}(x)\right]d^{3}\sigma_{\nu}(x), \tag{4}$$

where $d^{3}\sigma^{\mu}$ are the components of the infinitesimal volume element of a three-dimensional spacelike hypersurface Σ, $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ is a stress-energy tensor which describes nonelectromagnetic forces and matter (including the Poincaré stresses, [17] while $T^{\mu\nu}$ is the energy-momentum density tensor of the electromagnetic field. The sum $T_{tot.}^{\mu\nu}=\Theta^{\mu\nu}(x)+T^{\mu\nu}$ is divergenceless, $\partial_{\nu}T_{tot.}^{\mu\nu}=0$, causing that the hyperplane integral (4) is independent of the orientation of that hyperplane, which enables one to choose Σ as the plain $t=a$ in S and $t'=b$ in S'. Both stress-energy tensors in (4),$\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ and $T^{\mu\nu}$, are taken synchronously in S and S', i.e., at a single time in the observer's frame. But, as shown in the preceding section, contrary to the assertions in [2, 3, 15, 16], (which are based on von Laue's theorem), the integral over the hyperplane $t=const.$, i.e., $P_{tot.}^{\mu}$ (4), is not a true 4-vector, since the transformation of that integral is - an AT.

3.1 The Electromagnetic Component

Using such synchronous definitions, i.e., the choice $t=const.$ for the hypersurface Σ in *the observer's frame*, and considering only the electromagnetic component with $T^{\mu\nu}$ expressed in terms of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, one finds the conventional form for P^{μ} of the field in an IFR S

$$P_{f}^{\mu}=(1/c)\int_{t=a}T^{\mu 0}(\mathbf{r},t)d^{3}x \tag{5}$$

and the traditional expressions for the field energy and momentum:

$$\begin{aligned} cP_{f}^{0} &= U_{f}=(\varepsilon_{0}/2)\int_{t=a}\left[\mathbf{E}^{2}(\mathbf{r},t)+c^{2}\mathbf{B}^{2}(\mathbf{r},t)\right]d^{3}x=\int_{t=a}u(\mathbf{r},t)d^{3}x, \\ \mathbf{P}_{f} &= \varepsilon_{0}\int_{t=a}\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r},t)\times\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r},t)d^{3}x=\int_{t=a}\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{r},t)d^{3}x. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

(Note that P_{f}^{μ} (5-6) is not a legitimate 4-vector and the notation with the superscripts is not appropriate, but here we retain such notation due to historical reasons.) For the determination of P_{f}' and $P_{f}'^{0}$ in S' one needs to perform: 1) the transformations of the integrals, i.e., of the hypersurfaces $t=const.$, which are the AT, and 2) the AT (1) of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. This means that the conventional synchronous definitions of the electromagnetic energy and momentum are not in accordance with the "TT relativity;" the energy- momentum (5-6) as a synchronously determined nonlocal physical quantity in an IFR has nothing to do with the corresponding quantity relevant to observers in another IFR.

3.2 The Poincaré Stresses and the Nonelectromagnetic Component

In addition, it has to be mentioned that the origin and nature of the Poincaré stresses, which are included in $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ component, are unknown, and, in fact, Poincaré stresses are not measurable physical quantities. Such a theory with Poincaré's stresses is like the theories which tried in the synchronous formulation of nonlocal physical quantities to resolve the problem of equilibrium in the special relativity, particularly the right-angled lever problem, by introducing the fictive energy current, von Laue's energy current [18]; (many others repeated Laue's explanation, see, e.g., Ref. 19). But, as Aranoff [20] stated in his severe criticism of von Laue's explanation: "The energy current idea of von Laue has to go the way of phlogiston, and the ether. It is interesting how man has to invent very fine fluids which carry energy but which are otherwise unobservable." Exactly the same statement is appropriate for the Poincaré stresses.

It is interesting to discuss in more detail the explanations given for the nonelectromagnetic component $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ in the theories [2, 3, 15, 16]. Boyer [2] considers a spherical shell of charge (as a model of the classical electron) in different IFRs. He concludes that, in an improper IFR, there is a net transfer of energy and momentum from the mechanical stabilizing forces to the electromagnetic field as a consequence of the relativity of simultaneity, i.e., as a result of the nonsimultaneity of the "clamping" of the forces of constraint on the moving charged shell. On the other hand, according to [2], there is no such transfer in the rest frame since there the forces of constraint were applied simultaneously. However, we note that the relativity of simultaneity is not an intrinsic feature of relativity, but it is a coordinate dependent effect, i.e., it depends on the kind of synchronization procedure adopted, and thus on the adopted coordinatization procedure of Minkowski spacetime. This means that the above mentioned transfer of energy and momentum [2], will depend on the adopted synchronization procedure and particularly for the synchronization with absolute simultaneity, (see, e.g., Ref. 21), the net transfer would need to disappear. Thus the changes in energy and momentum of the moving charged shell which own their existence to the relativity of simultaneity are, in fact, unphysical. Therefore, the assertions given in [2] about the validity and the relativistic correctness of the traditional definitions (5-6) in every IFR, taken at a single time in that frame, are unfounded.

Boyer used the relativity of simultaneity to obtain the additional contributions to the "pure electromagnetic" energy and momentum (5-6) for a moving charged system, i.e., during a transformation from the rest frame to another IFR. Instead of that the energy increment is explained in [15] as arising from the forces of constraint due to work done by these forces during the Lorentz contraction of a moving charged system. The additional contribution to the electromagnetic momentum of a moving charged system is associated in [15] with the energy flow (as von Laue's energy current) due to forces of constraint. But, as shown in Sec. 2, the Lorentz contraction is an AT. This fact, together with the use of the synchronous definitions (5-6), causes that neither the treatment in [15] do conform with the "TT relativity."

In [16] a parallel plates capacitor and a uniformly charged spherical shell were considered. In a similar way as in [2] and [15], it is attempted in [16] to obtain $T_{tot.}^{\mu\nu}$, which is divergenceless. A special gaseous substance (a special kind of "molecules" that are considered as moving particles or as continuous gaseous substance) is introduced in order to provide the additional energy and momentum needed to balance the electromagnetic energy and momentum. We remark that this gaseous substance is the same kind of substance as that one involved in von Laue's energy current, i.e., as Aranoff [20] states: "....very fine fluids which carry energy but which are otherwise unobservable." Really it is assumed in [16] that the mentioned "molecules" carry the energy and momentum but they do not interact with one another and: " do not change the dielectric properties of the medium between the plates which is the same as that of the vacuum."

We see that in the conventional definitions (4), (5-6) the treatment of the electromagnetic component includes the AT of the hyperplane $t = const.$ and the AT of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, while the treatment of the nonelectromagnetic component introduces and uses unphysical quantities.

4 ROHRLICH'S DEFINITIONS OF THE ELECTROMAGNETIC MOMENTUM 4-VECTOR

Next, we consider Rohrlich's definition of the electromagnetic momentum 4-vector and the appropriate transformations of the electromagnetic energy and momentum. Instead of the traditional, synchronous, definitions (5-6) in the observer's frame Rohrlich [22, 23, 1] defines the energy and momentum of the electromagnetic field in a relativistic covariant way. The general manifestly covariant definition of the electromagnetic 4-momentum in any IFR is given by (4) without the nonelectromagnetic part, i.e., as

$$P_f^\mu = (1/c)\int_\Sigma T^{\mu\nu}(x)d^3\sigma_\nu(x), \tag{7}$$

with the same meaning of symbols as in (4). The energy momentum tensor $T^{\mu\nu}$ is given in terms of $F^{\mu\nu}$ as

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon_0\left[F^{\mu\alpha}F_\alpha^\nu + (1/4)g^{\mu\nu}F_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta}.\right] \tag{8}$$

Rohrlich [1, 22, 23] defined the electromagnetic energy-momentum for a system in uniform motion as the Lorentz boosted rest frame, and the hyperplane of integration is specified to be the plane in which the system is at rest. In such a way it is achieved that P_f^μ is a 4-vector even though there are sources present. In the IFR $S_{(0)}$ in which the system is at rest Rohrlich chooses the hypersurface Σ in (7) to be the plane $\Sigma_{(0)} = t_{(0)} = const.$. *The same Σ is considered from all other IFRs as required by the covariant approach,* i.e., in some IFR S obtained by the Lorentz transformation L from $S_{(0)}$, Σ in (7) is $L\Sigma_{(0)}$. $d^3\sigma_\nu$ in an IFR S can be written as $d^3\sigma^\nu = n^\nu d^3\sigma$, where n^ν being a timelike vector normal to the hyperplane Σ, $n^\nu = \Gamma(1,\beta)$, ($\beta = \mathbf{V}/c$, $\mathbf{V}$ is the 3-velocity of the frame S relative to $S_{(0)}$). In $S_{(0)}$ $n_{(0)}^\mu = (1,\mathbf{0})$. $d^3\sigma$ is an invariant and it is $= dV_{(0)}$, where $dV_{(0)}$ is the infinitesimal element of the 3D spatial volume $V_{(0)}$, i.e., of the 3D hyperplane $t_{(0)} = const.$, in the rest frame $S_{(0)}$ of the system. *We see that in Rohrlich's approach one always integrates over the hyperplane which is the transformed three space of the rest frame.* Obviously, according to the construction, i.e., since always the same physical quantity is considered from different IFRs and only the TT are used, it is found that the quantity P_f^μ (7) is a legitimate 4-vector. However, when Rohrlich explicitly calculates (7) for specific physical system he also writes, as all others, the electromagnetic energy and momentum densities in terms of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ and uses the AT (1).

5 ELECTROMAGNETIC MOMENTUM 4-VECTOR IN TERMS OF E^α AND B^α

In order to remove the last element from the theory that is not in accordance with the "TT relativity," we write $T^{\mu\nu}$ and P_f^μ in terms of covariant quantities E^α and B^α. Then we compare so obtained $T^{\mu\nu}$ and P_f^μ with traditional definitions of the electromagnetic energy and momentum (5-6) and with Rohrlich's expressions (3.23) and (3.24) in [23] or with the expressions for P_e^0 and P_e^k obtained in [1] for the choice (II).

Using the relations (3) we express $F^{\alpha\beta}$ and thus also $T^{\mu\nu}$ (7) in terms of E^α and B^α. The obtained covariant expression for the symmetric energy-momentum density tensor $T^{\mu\nu}$ is the following

$$\begin{aligned} T^{\mu\nu} \;=\; & \varepsilon_0\left[-((g^{\mu\nu}/2) + v^\mu v^\nu/c^2)(E_\alpha E^\alpha + c^2 B_\alpha B^\alpha)\right. \\ & + E^\mu E^\nu + c^2 B^\mu B^\nu \\ & + (1/c)\varepsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma}B_\alpha(v^\nu v_\gamma E_\beta - E^\nu v_\beta v_\gamma) \\ & \left. + (1/c)\varepsilon^{\nu\alpha\beta\gamma}B_\alpha(v^\mu v_\gamma E_\beta - E^\mu v_\beta v_\gamma)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Introducing (9) into (7) one finds the explicit expression for the covariantly defined electromagnetic 4-momentum P_f^μ. All parts of the expression (7) with $T^{\mu\nu}$ from (9) are covariantly defined quantities which transform according to the TT, i.e., according to the LT; in another IFR S' moving with the 4-velocity V^μ relative to S the 4-momentum (7) with $T^{\mu\nu}$ defined by (9) will have the same form but with primed quantities replacing the unprimed ones.

5.1 P_f^μ in $S_{(0)}$ and S

Let us now use the above manifestly covariant expression for P_f^μ with E^α and B^α to examine some specific cases considered in [1] and [2]. First we write $T_{(0)}^{\mu\nu}$ and $P_{f(0)}^\mu$ in $S_{(0)}$, the rest frame of the charged sphere, i.e., when u^α (the 4-velocity of the charge) is $u^\alpha = (c,\mathbf{0})$, whence $n_{(0)\nu} = (-1,\mathbf{0})$.

The observers who measure $E_{(0)}^{\alpha}$ and $B_{(0)}^{\alpha}$ are taken to be at rest in $S_{(0)}$, and thus v^{α} (the 4-velocity of the observers) is $v^{\alpha}=u^{\alpha}=(c,\mathbf{0})$. For such observers in $S_{(0)}$ one finds $E_{(0)}^{0}=0$, $B_{(0)}^{0}=0$ and only $E_{(0)}^{i}\neq 0$. From

$$P_{f(0)}^{\mu}=(1/c)\int_{\Sigma_{(0)}}T_{(0)}^{\mu\nu}n_{(0)\nu}dV_{(0)}, \tag{10}$$

we find that

$$P_{f(0)}^{0}=-(1/c)\int_{\Sigma_{(0)}}T_{(0)}^{00}dV_{(0)},\quad P_{f(0)}^{i}=-(1/c)\int_{\Sigma_{(0)}}T_{(0)}^{i0}dV_{(0)}=0, \tag{11}$$

where from (9) the components of $T_{(0)}^{\mu\nu}$ can be expressed in terms of $E_{(0)}^{\alpha}$ and $B_{(0)}^{\alpha}$ as $T_{(0)}^{00}=-u_{E(0)}=-(\varepsilon_0/2)(E_{(0)}^{i}E_{(0)i})$, $T_{(0)}^{i0}=T_{(0)}^{0i}=0$, $T_{(0)}^{11}=\varepsilon_0(E_{(0)}^{1})^2-u_{E(0)}$, and similarly for $T_{(0)}^{22}$ and $T_{(0)}^{33}$ with indexes 2 and 3 replacing the index 1, and $T_{(0)}^{ij}=T_{(0)}^{ji}=\varepsilon_0 E_{(0)}^{i}E_{(0)}^{j}$, with $i\neq j$. $E_{(0)}^{i}$ are the space components of the 4-vector $E_{(0)}^{\alpha}$ and they correspond to the usual Coulomb field. Thus the self-energy due to the Coulomb field $U_{f(0)}$ and the space part $P_{f(0)}^{i}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} U_{f(0)} &= cP_{f(0)}^{0}=\int_{\Sigma_{(0)}}u_{E(0)}dV_{(0)}=(\varepsilon_0/2)\int_{\Sigma_{(0)}}E_{(0)}^{i}E_{(0)i}dV_{(0)}, \\ P_{f(0)}^{i} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

In order to find the 4-momentum P_f^{μ}, Eq. (7), in another IFR S moving with the 4-velocity $V^{\alpha}=(\Gamma c,\Gamma V,0,0)$ relative to $S_{(0)}$ one can either transform $P_{f(0)}^{\mu}$ as a 4-vector from $S_{(0)}$ to S, or to transform all quantities on the right-hand side of (10) from $S_{(0)}$ to S. The same result is obtained and it is

$$P_f^0=\Gamma P_{f(0)}^0,\quad P_f^1=-\beta\Gamma P_{f(0)}^0,\quad P_f^2=P_f^3=0. \tag{13}$$

Note that the same family of observers who measures $E_{(0)}^{\alpha}$ and $B_{(0)}^{\alpha}$ in $S_{(0)}$ is considered in all other IFRs. Wee see that, when referred to the invariant 3D integration volume $dV_{(0)}$, the energy density u_E in the IFR S moving with $V^{\alpha}=(\Gamma c,\Gamma V,0,0)$ relative to $S_{(0)}$ is $\Gamma u_{E(0)}$, contrary to the results in [1, 22, 23].

5.2 The ("4/3") Factor

We can use these results to discuss the famous "4/3" factor appearing in the problem of the electromagnetic mass of the classical electron, (see, e.g., Refs. 1-3). Let us suppose that in the rest system $S_{(0)}$ the whole mass m of the electron (considered as a sphere of radius R with a uniform surface charge density) is due to electrostatic energy of the field. Using the traditional, synchronous, definitions (5-6), one finds that in $S_{(0)}$ $cP_{f(0)}^0=mc^2=U_{f(0)}$, and $\mathbf{P}_{f(0)}=0$. In an IFR S in which the particle moves with the velocity $\mathbf{u}$ one obtains from (5-6) $P_f^0=\Gamma m(1+\mathbf{u}^2/3)$, and $\mathbf{P}_f=(4/3)\Gamma m\mathbf{u}$, (see eqations (11) and (12) in Rohrlich's criticism [1] of the work [2]). We see that the spurious 4/3 factor appears in $\mathbf{P}_f$. Of course, as already said, the quantities P_f^0 and $\mathbf{P}_f$ do not form a 4-vector. Because of that f_{coh}^{μ}, the force density that provides the Poincaré stresses, is introduced into the theory. Then P_{coh}^0 and $\mathbf{P}_{coh}$ are calculated by means of f_{coh}^{μ} in such a way to give that the sum of two false 4-vectors P_f^{μ} and P_{coh}^{μ} is a hyperplane integral independent of the orientation of that hyperplane. Applying von Laue's theorem it is concluded by the proponents of the synchronous definitions that such sum is a legitimate 4-vector, (see, e.g., Ref. 1 Eqs. (14) and (15)). However, despite the fact that the sum $P_f^{\mu}+P_{coh}^{\mu}$ can be written in the form of a 4-vector, i.e., as mv^{μ}, (see equation (15) in [1]), this quantity is not a true 4-vector. As we have already shown this sum does not refer to the same quantity considered in different IFRs; the plains $t_{(0)}=a$ in $S_{(0)}$ and $t=b$ in S are not related by the LT than by the AT, and the relations (1) connecting $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ in S and $\mathbf{E}_{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{(0)}$ in $S_{(0)}$ are not the LT of the same quantities from $S_{(0)}$ to S, than they are also the AT.

In contrast to the synchronous definitions considered in [2, 3, 15, 16], Rohrlich's expressions for P_f^0 and P_f^k in S, derived in the Appendix in [1], give that P_f^{μ} alone can be written as mv^{μ}, and accordingly it is also concluded in [1], by the use of von Laue's theorem, that P_f^μ is a true 4-vector. In Rohrlich's approach there is no spurious $4/3$ factor in P_f^μ, and, in contrast to Boyer's approach, Rohrlich's Σ in S is correctly determined as $L\Sigma_{(0)}$. But, as already said, neither Rohrlich's P_f^μ is a legitimate 4-vector, since he uses the AT of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$. The use of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ and the AT (1) in [1] instead of the 4-vectors E^α and B^α and their LT causes the difference between the results obtained in [1] for the energy and momentum densities and for P_f^0 and P_f^k, and the corresponding expressions obtained here, Eqs. (12) and (13).

>From (11,12) and (13) we see that in the covariant approach presented here the spurious factor $4/3$ does not appear and that "pure electromagnetic" P_f^μ is a legitimate 4-vector; it refers to the same quantity in all IFRs since all parts of it are Lorentz transformed when going from IFR $S_{(0)}$ to some IFR S.

5.3 Rohrlich's P_f^0 and P_f^k from P_f^μ with E^α and B^α

The expressions for P_f^μ (written with E^α and B^α) corresponding to Rohrlich's relations for P_f^0 and P_f^k with $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ [1], can be obtained in the following way. Let the IFR S be the frame in which the particle moves with the 4-velocity $u^\alpha = (\gamma_u c, \gamma_u u, 0, 0)$, and therefore the unit 4-vector n^μ is $n^\mu = (\gamma_u, \gamma_u \beta_u, 0, 0)$. The 4-momentum is given by (7). Using these relations we write the components of P_f^μ as

$$\begin{aligned} P_f^0 &= -(\gamma_u/c)\int dV_{(0)}\left[T^{00} - \beta_u T^{10}\right], \\ P_f^i &= -(\gamma_u/c)\int dV_{(0)}\left[T^{0i} - \beta_u T^{1i}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Further, let the observers who measure the fields E^α and B^α in S are at rest in S, i.e., their 4-velocity v^α is $v^\alpha = (c, \mathbf{0})$. For such observers $E^0 = B^0 = 0$. Then from (9) we find that $T^{\mu\nu}$ can be written in terms of the components of E^α and B^α as

$$\begin{aligned} T^{00} &= -u_E = -(\varepsilon_0/2)(E^i E_i + c^2 B^i B_i), \\ T^{0i} &= -\varepsilon_0 c \varepsilon_{ijk} E^j B^k, \\ T^{11} &= \varepsilon_0((E^1)^2 + c^2 (B^1)^2) - u_E, \\ T^{1n} &= \varepsilon_0(E^1 E^n + c^2 B^1 B^n), \quad n = 2, 3. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

When $T^{\mu\nu}$ from (15) is introduced into (14) then P_f^0 and P_f^i seem like P_e^0 and P_e^i for the choice (II) in.[1]. *But the 4-vectors E^α and B^α in (15) are measured by the observers at rest in S*, i.e., whose velocity is $v^\alpha = (c, \mathbf{0})$, which means that these E^α and B^α are not the LT of the previously mentioned $E_{(0)}^\alpha$ and $B_{(0)}^\alpha$ (for which $v^\alpha = (c, \mathbf{0})$ in $S_{(0)}$). Thus we find that, contrary to the derivation in the Appendix of [1], Eq. (14) with $T^{\mu\nu}$ determined by (15) is not the LT of $P_{f(0)}^\mu$ (11,12). The LT of $P_{f(0)}^\mu$ are actually given by (13), as it is shown above. If one performs the same procedure as in the Appendix of [1] expressing the 4-vectors E^α and B^α in S by means of $E_{(0)}^{\prime\alpha}$ and $B_{(0)}^{\prime\alpha}$, the 4-vectors in the rest frame $S_{(0)}$ of the charged sphere, which are connected by the LT with E^α and B^α, then one does not find P_e^0 and P_e^i obtained for the choice (II) in.[1]. The 4-vectors $E_{(0)}^{\prime\alpha}$ and $B_{(0)}^{\prime\alpha}$ are not equivalent to the previously considered (in connection with (11-13)) 4-vectors $E_{(0)}^\alpha$ and $B_{(0)}^\alpha$; the former refer to the electric and magnetic fields which are measured in S by the observers at rest in S and then Lorentz transformed to $S_{(0)}$, while the latter refer to the electric and magnetic fields which are measured directly in $S_{(0)}$ by the observers at rest in $S_{(0)}$. The preceding discussion reveals that the difference between the results in [1] and in this paper is, as already said, a consequence of the use of the 3-vectors $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ and the AT (1) in [1], and the use of the 4-vectors E^α and B^α and their LT in this paper.

6 SOME RECENT TREATMENTS OF THE ELECTROMAGNETIC MOMENTUM AND ENERGY

In this section we consider some recent treatments of the electromagnetic energy and momentum.

6.1 Romer's Question and Answers

Recently Romer [24] revived the question of the correct expressions for the electromagnetic field momentum and energy in the case of "bound" fields, fields that are tied to their sources. He, and many others (see references in [24]), uses the traditional synchronous definitions (5-6). As we have already shown the relations (5-6) contain the AT of the hyperplane $t = const.$ and the AT of **E** and **B**. Different answers to this question have been given in [25]. Neither the answers [25] to the question in [24] are in a complete agreement with the "TT relativity." First, they also work with **E** and **B** and their AT (1), and base their conclusions on von Laue's theorem.

6.2 Schwinger's Consideration of the "4/3" Problem

We have to mention an interesting consideration of the electromagnetic energy and momentum and the electromagnetic mass given in [26] by Schwinger. He also uses the synchronous definition of P_f^μ (5). In difference to the works [2, 3, 15, 16] he does not deal with Poincaré's stresses, but changes the definition of the electromagnetic energy-momentum tensor $T^{\mu\nu}$ (8). As it is already said $T^{\mu\nu}$ (8) is not divergence-free and therefore the hyperplane integral of $T^{\mu\nu}$ (7), is dependent of the orientation of the hyperplane. Schwinger construes, but only for a class of fields and currents, associated with uniform motion, a new, conserved, divergenceless, energy-momentum tensor $T_{Sch.}^{\mu\nu}$ of the electromagnetic field. Since $\partial_\nu T_{Sch.}^{\mu\nu} = 0$ it is achieved in [26] that the hyperplane integral (7), (with $T_{Sch.}^{\mu\nu}$ replacing $T^{\mu\nu}$ (8)), is independent of the orientation of that hyperplane, and this is considered by Schwinger too as a necessary and sufficient condition that the integral (7) is a true 4-vector, i.e., he also accepts von Laue's theorem as that it is a correct one from the "TT viewpoint." Then choosing that Σ in (7) is the plane $t = a$ in some IFR S the integral (7) becomes the synchronous definition of P_f^μ (5). Also it has to be noted that the tensor $T_{Sch.}^{\mu\nu}$ is not unique, and for the same field-current distribution one can have different $T_{Sch.}^{\mu\nu}$, e.g., the tensor (1) equation (42) and the tensor (2) equation (44) in [26]. Using different $T_{Sch.}^{\mu\nu}$ ((1) and (2) in [26]) two different "covariant" versions of the concept of electromagnetic mass were obtained in [26]. We note that the same remarks as for the usual synchronous definitions hold also here; $t_{(0)} = const.$ in $S_{(0)}$ and $t = a$ in S are not related by the LT than by the AT. Further, the energy and momentum in [26] are ultimately expressed in terms of **E** and **B**, (see equations (43), (45) and (46) in [26]). Thus, contrary to the assertions in [26], we conclude that even though the energy and momentum defined by (5) (with $T_{Sch.}^{\mu 0}$ instead of $T^{\mu 0}$) transform like a 4-vector (see equations (62-63) in [26]), these equations, which are derived from P_f^μ (5), do not define a true 4-vector, i.e., they do not covariantly define the energy and momentum of the "bound" electromagnetic field. The AT are used in the derivation in [26], whence one concludes that neither the equations (62) based on rest mass $m^{(2)}$ nor the relations (63) based on rest mass $m^{(1)}$ do refer to the same physical quantity considered from different IFRs.

6.3 Some Other Treatments

Recently the electromagnetic mass derived from the self-force and the $4/3$ factor were discussed in [27]. These works will not be considered here, but we only mention that, ultimately, they use the synchronous definitions and the 3-vectors **E** and **B**.

In the recent work [14] the covariant Majorana formulation of electrodynamics is constructed. There, the covariant expression (with the 4-vectors E^α and B^α) for $T^{\mu\nu}$ is obtained, and it is equal to our Eq. (9). But, as we have said, Esposito [14] considers the fields E^α and B^α as "auxiliary" fields, while the 3-vector fields **E** and **B** are considered as physical fields. The situation is just the opposite in our alternative covariant approach.

The preceding discussion indicates that the correct definitions from the "TT viewpoint" of the electromagnetic 4-momentum have to contain only covariantly defined quantities, including the 4-vectors E^α and B^α instead of the usual 3-vectors **E** and **B**, and the TT of 4D tensor quantities instead of the AT. Such relations are the expressions (7-15) in this paper.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The fundamental difference between the apparent and true transformations of physical quantities, which is previously mainly overlooked, enabled us to reveal that the usual formulation of electrodynamics with the 3-vectors **E** and **B** is not in agreement with the "TT relativity." Different definitions of the electromagnetic energy and momentum are shown to be invalid from the "TT viewpoint" since they contain either the AT of volume, or the AT of **E** and **B**, or both of them. We have constructed a covariant formulation of electrodynamics with the 4-vectors E^{α} and B^{α} equally as valid as the usual covariant approach with $F^{\alpha\beta}$. The covariant expression for the symmetric energy-momentum density tensor $T^{\mu\nu}$ is obtained by means of E^{α} and B^{α}. The electromagnetic 4-momentum P_f^{μ} with E^{α} and B^{α} is shown to be a true 4-vector. P_f^{μ} refers to the same quantity considered in different IFRs, since all parts of it are transformed by the LT from an IFR S to relatively moving IFR S'.

We emphasize that this approach with E^{α} and B^{α} is not restricted to the classical electrodynamics but refers in the same measure to the quantum electrodynamics. The 3-vectors **E** and **B**, (whose transformations are the AT), can be replaced by the 4-vectors E^{α} and B^{α}, (which transform according to the TT), in the quantum electrodynamics as well. The use of E^{α} and B^{α} in the quantization of the electromagnetic field does have important advantages: 1) E^{α} and B^{α} are covariant quantities, 2) one does not need to use the intermediate electromagnetic 4-potential A^{μ}, and thus dispenses with the need for gauge conditions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to Prof. F. Rohrlich for suggestions how to improve the presentation of the paper and, for the same reason, to an anonymous referee.

References

[1] F. Rohrlich, *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 3251 (1982).

[2] T.H. Boyer, *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 3246 (1982).

[3] I. Campos and J.L. Jiménez, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 607 (1986).

[4] F. Rohrlich, *Nuovo Cimento B* **45**, 76 (1966).

[5] A. Gamba, *Am. J. Phys.* **35**, 83 (1967).

[6] T. Ivezić, preprint SCAN-9802018; preprint SCAN-9810078 (on the CERN server).

[7] Ø. Grøn, *Am. J. Phys.* **46**, 249 (1978); T. Ivezić, *Phys. Rev. E* **52**, 5505 (1995).

[8] A. Einstein, *Ann. Physik* **17**, 891 (1905), tr. by W. Perrett and G.B. Jeffery, in *The principle of relativity* (Dover, New York).

[9] C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (Freeman, San Francisco, 1970).

[10] W. Pauli, *The theory of relativity* (Pergamon Press, London, 1958); S.A. Teukolsky, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 1104 (1996).

[11] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 2nd edn. (Wiley, New York, 1977).

[12] R. M. Wald, *General relativity* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984); D.A.T. Vanzella, G.E.A. Matsas, H.W. Crater, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 1075 (1996).

[13] J.L. Anderson and J.W. Ryon, *Phys. Rev.* **181**, 1765 (1969); P. Hillion, *Phys. Rev. E* **48**, 3060 (1993).

[14] S. Esposito, *Found. Phys.* **28**, 231 (1998).

[15] A.K. Singal, *J. Phys. A* **25**, 1605 (1992).

[16] E. Comay, *Z. Naturforsch.* **46a**, 377 (1991).

[17] H. Poincaré, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* **21**, 129 (1906).

[18] M. von Laue, *Phys. Zeits.* **12**, 1008 (1911).

[19] W. Pauli, The theory of relativity (Pergamon Press, London, 1958); W.K.H. Panofsky and M. Phillips, *Classical electricity and magnetism*, 2nd edn. (Addison-Wesley, Reading, PA, 1962).

[20] S. Aranoff, *Nuovo Cimento B* **10**, 155 (1972).

[21] G. Cavalleri and C. Bernasconi, *Nuovo Cimento B* **104**, 545 (1989); C. Leubner, K. Aufinger and P. Krumm, *Eur. J. Phys.* **13**, 170 (1992).

[22] F. Rohrlich, *Classical charged particles*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1965).

[23] F. Rohrlich, *Am. J. Phys.* **38**, 1310 (1970).

[24] R.H. Romer, *Am. J. Phys.* **63**, 777 (1995).

[25] K. McDonald, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 15 (1996); F. Rohrlich, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 16 (1996); B.R. Holstein, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 17 (1996).

[26] J. Schwinger, *Found. Phys.* **13**, 373 (1983).

[27] J. Frenkel, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 5859 (1996); H. Kolbenstvedt, *Phys. Lett. A* **234**, 319 (1997).